

Request for Reconsideration
U.S. Patent Application Ser. No.: 10/084,204

I. The Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,859.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending application 10/035,137.

While Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is not obvious over the claims of U.S. Patent 6,379,859 and the claims of copending application 10/035,137, to expedite allowance of the present Application, Applicants are submitting herewith terminal disclaimers to obviate each of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the obviousness-type double patenting rejections over U.S. Patent 6,379,859 and copending application 10/035,137 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. The Examiner states that quinonediazide methyl galate is present in all of the examples and is required to provide the improved resist pattern having a good shape.